

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-38 are pending in the application.

Claims 20 and 38 are currently amended. The Examiner has offered rejections against Claims 20-38. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 20, indicating that the word "separately" should be changed to "separate". The Applicant believes the phrase "separately from" is proper, however, in the interests of expediting the examination of the application, the Applicant has amended the term to "separate".

The Examiner has rejected Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Although the Applicant believes that with a reading of intervening Claim 22, Claim 38 is very clear regarding the reference to opening and closing of individual receivers, the Applicant has amended the claim to clarify such in the interests of expediting examination.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,073,372 to List. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The Examiner has presented List as disclosing "an apparatus for handling articles between process stations . . . wherein said conveying device is disposed between at least two process stations". The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's representation of the List patent. List teaches instead an "apparatus for transporting containers to and from a working station" (See Abstract; Figures; Col. 1, lines 35-40; Col. 3, lines 54-57; Col. 4, line 20; Claim 1.) List does not teach multiple processing stations as set forth in Claim 20 of the present application, and therefore all the remaining dependent claims 21-

38. As a result, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and place the claims in line for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. (a) as obvious over List in view of Toshima. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. In view of the arguments and amendments listed above, the combinations of the references cited do not disclose the entire apparatus as claimed. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference to combine the references. As a result, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and place the claims in line for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 25-32, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. (a) as obvious over List in view of Lynch. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. In view of the arguments and amendments listed above, the combinations of the references cited do not disclose the entire apparatus as claimed. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference to combine the references. As a result, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and place the claims in line for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. (a) as obvious over List in view of Bacchi et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. In view of the arguments and amendments listed above, the combinations of the references cited do not disclose the entire apparatus as claimed. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference to combine the references. As a result, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and place the claims in line for allowance.

The Applicant has attempted to be fully responsive to the office action and believes the claims should now be in line for allowance. However, if the Examiner feels that it would be helpful, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call from him in order to discuss any outstanding issues and to expedite placement of the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Becker, Reg. 26,255
Attorney for Applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES
707 Highway 66 East, Suite B
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059

Telephone: 505 286 3511
Telefax: 505 286 3524

RWB:KCF:mac